

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

William Singletary, Jr.,)	C/A No. 9:11-2658-TLW-BM
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Report and Recommendation
)	for
Edgefield Sheriff Department;)	Partial Summary Dismissal
Adell Dobey, <i>Edgefield County Sheriff</i> ;)	
Ronald Carter;)	
Officer Michael Butts;)	
Corp. Mark Pica;)	
Lieutenant Mike Cockrell;)	
Captain Chris Wash;)	
Sergeant Michael Raffield;)	
Lt. Jagger;)	
Lt. Hall;)	
C/O Joshua Jones;)	
C/O Prince;)	
Deputy Florida;)	
Sgt. Kyther Potts, <i>denied Civil Rights</i> ;)	
Magistrate Judge Brenda Carpenter;)	
Southern Health Partners, <i>Detention Med. Services</i> ;)	
Dr. Tami Y. Massey;)	
Edgefield Hospital;)	
Edgefield Detention Center,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, a resident of Edgefield County, is a former prisoner at the Edgefield County Detention Center. Plaintiff has submitted a civil rights action concerning matters at the Edgefield County Detention Center as well as matters not involving the Edgefield County Detention Center.



In a separately-filed order, the undersigned is authorizing service of process upon all Defendants **except** the Edgefield Sheriff's Department, Magistrate Judge Brenda Carpenter, and the Edgefield Detention Center.

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Prison Litigation Reform Act, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). Further, as Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972); *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975).

Even when considered under this less stringent standard, however, the undersigned finds and concludes that some of the Defendants are entitled to dismissal without service of process. A plaintiff must plead factual content that allows the Court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is plausibly liable, not merely possibly liable; *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009); and the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

First, the Edgefield (County) Sheriff's Department is immune from suit. Sheriff's Departments in South Carolina are state agencies, not municipal departments. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 23-13-550 (2008); 1975 S.C.Att'y.Gen'l.Op. No. 47 (Jan. 22, 1975); and S.C. Code Ann. § 23-13-10 (2008), which provides that only the Sheriff has the authority to hire or terminate employees of the Sheriff's Department, and that the Sheriff is responsible for neglect of duty or misconduct by a deputy sheriff. *See also Edwards v. Lexington County Sheriff's Department*, 386 S.C. 285, 287 n. 1, 688 S.E.2d 125, 127 n.1 (2010) ("However, under South Carolina law, the sheriff and sheriff's deputies are State, not county, employees."); *Allen v. Fidelity and Deposit Company*, 515 F. Supp. 1185, 1189-91 (D.S.C. 1981) (County cannot be held liable for actions of deputy sheriff because deputy sheriffs serve at pleasure of the Sheriff, not the County), *affirmed*, 694 F.2d 716 (4th Cir. 1982) [Table]; and *Comer v. Brown*, 88 F.3d 1315, 1332 (4th Cir. 1996) (suit against Sheriff of Greenville County: ". . . Sheriff Brown is an arm of the State."). Indeed, any damages to the plaintiff, if awarded in this case, would be paid by the South Carolina State Insurance Reserve Fund. *Comer v. Brown*, 88 F.3d at 1332 ("Judgments against the Greenville County Sheriff are paid by the South Carolina State Insurance Reserve Fund."). Therefore, the Edgefield Sheriff's Department is entitled to dismissal as a party Defendant.

The Edgefield (County) Detention Center is also subject to summary dismissal. The Edgefield (County) Detention Center is a group of buildings or a facility, and inanimate objects – such as buildings, facilities, and grounds – do not act under color of state law. Hence, the Edgefield (County) Detention Center is not a "person" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Allison v. California Adult Authority*, 419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969) (California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *Preval v. Reno*, 57

F. Supp. 2d 307, 310 (E.D. Va. 1999) (“[T]he Piedmont Regional Jail is not a ‘person,’ and therefore not amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”); and *Brooks v. Pembroke City Jail*, 722 F. Supp. 1294, 1301 (E.D.N.C. 1989) (“Claims under § 1983 are directed at ‘persons’ and the jail is not a person amenable to suit.”). *Cf. Roach v. West Virginia Regional Jail and Correctional Facility*, 74 F.3d 46, 48 (4th Cir. 1996).

Finally, Magistrate Judge Brenda Carpenter is immune from suit in the above-captioned civil rights action. *See Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991); *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 351-364 (1978); *Pressly v. Gregory*, 831 F.2d 514, 517 (4th Cir. 1987) (a suit by South Carolina inmate against two Virginia magistrates); and *Chu v. Griffith*, 771 F.2d 79, 81 (4th Cir. 1985) (“It has long been settled that a judge is absolutely immune from a claim for damages arising out of his judicial actions.”). *See also Siegert v. Gilley*, 500 U.S. 226 (1991) (immunity presents a threshold question which should be resolved before discovery is even allowed); and *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 526 (1985) (absolute immunity “is an immunity from suit rather than a mere defense to liability”). *Accord Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234 (11th Cir. 2000) (discussing judicial immunity of United States District Judges and United States Circuit Judges). Therefore, this Defendant is also entitled to dismissal as a party Defendant in this case.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the Court summarily dismiss the Edgefield Sheriff’s Department, Magistrate Judge Brenda Carpenter, and the Edgefield Detention Center *without prejudice* and without service of process. *See Denton v. Hernandez*; *Neitzke v. Williams*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 (4th Cir. 1993); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) [essentially a redesignation of “old” § 1915(d)]; and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing,

district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal].

Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important Notice on the next page.



Bristow Marchant
United States Magistrate Judge

November 28, 2011
Charleston, South Carolina



Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

Plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (*quoting* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk of Court
United States District Court
Post Office Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).